



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

HERMES XLII.

Fascicle I.

Ethnika und Verwandtes III (W. Dittenberger). See A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 469, 470. In the pre-Roman period gentilia, subst. or adj., denoted a person as to his origin, tribal or political relationship; derivatives in -κός, a thing as belonging, or somehow related, to a people, country or city. And yet the usage is somewhat complex and many exceptions occur. Thus 'Αλικός for 'Αλιεύς avoided the suggestion of 'fisherman', Ποντικός originally meant one who reached his country by way of the Πόντος. Often derivatives in -κός supplied neuter forms that were lacking in gentilia, as γύναιον 'Ελληνικόν, μειράκιόν τι Μεγαλοπολιτικόν. Again in military usage (Xenophon, Polybius, etc., not Thucydides and Herodotus) -κός forms were applied to parts of the army as things (cf. the Latin instrum. abl.). Through the development of the city-state gentilia came to signify citizenship, as 'Ηρόδοτος Θούριος; hence women were called ἡ 'Αττική, Χαλκιδική, etc. ('Αθηναία in Pherecrates 'Γράες is comic), and likewise slaves; and although the Laconian perioeci were often called Λακεδαιμόνιοι (cf. Thuc. IV 53, 2), yet Xenophon uses Λακωνικός of an Asinaean (Anab. VII 2, 29) and -κός forms in inscriptions refer probably to the non-citizen class. They were used even of rulers (βασιλεύς, στρατηγός, etc.) who were not citizens or when their citizenship was disregarded. Again schools of philosophy, guilds of artists, poets, cooks might be called Μεγαρικοί, etc. The ξένοι Lysias, Isaeus and Dinarchus were 'Αττικοὶ ῥήτορες owing to the language employed; whereas the subject matter gave Fabius Pictor the title δ 'Ρωμαϊκός συγγραφεύς. Finally may be mentioned the characterizing force of derivatives in -κός. These distinctions began to disappear in the Hellenistic poets of the iii century B. C. (cf. Callimachus, Theocritus); but in prose not until the beginning of the Christian era.

Nochmals die Ciris und Vergil (F. Leo). This is a rejoinder to Skutsch's Gallus und Vergil, Aus Vergil's Frühzeit II Theil. 1906 (cf. A. J. P. XXIV 344). In seeking to establish the priority of the Ciris, S. now lays stress on the relative fitness of the common passages. He objects, viz.: to aera auribus captat (Aen. III 514) and to the position of suo in Aen. VI 780; but the testimony of sea-faring men justifies the former and the tendency for pronouns to congregate the latter. Leo makes some concessions, but maintains that not a single passage favors the priority of the Ciris. On the contrary many passages individually prove the

originality of Vergil. Moreover, Macrobius and the scholia teach us that Vergil never borrowed more than a single verse at a time, whereas S. would have us believe that he took blocks of three and four verses from the Ciris. A detailed examination of the last four verses of the Ciris (=Georg. I 406-409) vindicates them for Vergil. It is true the style of the Ciris points to an earlier period; but the fact of its dependence on Vergil shows that a new style for the Hellenistic epyllion had not yet been created; this was done by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*.

Topographische Probleme der Ilias (C. Robert). The name 'Scaean' implies two or, perhaps, three city gates (resp. *Σκαιαί, δεξιαί, μέσαι*). Accordingly the identity of the sixth city with Homer's Troy and the correctness of the topography in the oldest parts of the Iliad assumed, we must recognize the important VI S (Dörpfeld's map) as the 'left' gate. This eastern situation is made probable by Α and Π, and is conceivable in ρϕX. Further we must picture the field of battle as bounded by the Scamander (Mendere) on the west, the Simois and Troy on the east. Of course late and clearly interpolated passages have no value in deciding topographical questions. All passages bearing on these matters are thoroughly discussed.

Die Überlieferung des interpolierten Textes von Senecas Tragödien (Th. Düring). The text of Seneca's tragedies depends mainly upon the Etruscus (E) s. xi/xii; but as many of its original readings are erased or illegible recourse must be had to another, inferior, tradition (archetype A), preserved in a large number of MSS of the xiv and xv centuries, which present the tragedies in a different order from E, and contain the spurious Octavia. The oldest tradition of A is found in the readings found in the commentary of Nic. Treveth (1308-1321 A. D.). This commentary shows that Treveth's MS contained certain lacunae, and as Peiper found them in a small group of German MSS, both he and Richter accepted this A^r group as preserving the oldest tradition of A. F. Leo considered this result as insecurely supported and emphasized the value of Laurent. 37, 6 and Vat. 1647. Düring has now discovered that the aforesaid lacunae already existed in the archetype A itself, as they occur also in many Italian MSS and as the rest have clearly been supplied from E. This new criterion eliminates as authoritative the group A^r as well as Leo's L1 (contaminated with E), and shows the value of the uncontaminated Neapolit. iv D 47 and Laurent. 24 sin. 4, etc. Düring promises a description of A on this basis.

Die ἀσέβεια des Anaxagoras (J. Geffcken). The charge of impiety preferred against Anaxagoras is generally attributed to his regarding as natural phenomena, what in the popular religion appeared divine (viz. τὸν μὲν ἥλιον λίθον φησὶν εἶναι Plat. Apol. 26 D, cf. Plut. Per. 6), and not because he openly attacked the popular

belief, and yet Anaxagoras, who included lightning in his discussion of *μετέωρα* (cf. Diels Vorsokrat.² 308, 84), seems to have given currency to the observation that Zeus' thunderbolts are not directed against the wicked; but ohne Wahl zuckt der Strahl. This is shown especially by combining Arist. Nub. 398-402 with Luc. Timon 10, and we recognize the keenness of the ancient Voltaire's sarcasm, who lets the divine bolt miss the arch-heretic himself and strike a temple. Anaxagoras, then, is the source of the arguments which Cynics, Academicians and Epicureans used against the Stoic attempts to defend this popular superstition. The *ψήφισμα* of Diopithes (Plut. Per. 32) was, in a measure, justified.

Nochmals der *λόγος* des Königs Pausanias (E. Meyer). Diodorus' (vii 12) account of the legislation of Lycurgus is from Ephorus (cf. Polyb. VI 46, 10 and Strabo X 4, 16 ff.). Its distinctive feature is the citation of Delphic oracles, which Ephorus derived from the exiled Spartan king Pausanias, whose work Ephorus cites in his criticism of Hellanicus (Strabo VIII 5, 5, p. 366). Meyer formulates his main thesis anew (cf. A. J. P. X 242); because B. Niese (Nach. der Gött. Ges. d. W. 1906, p. 139 ff.) rejects it.

Zur Hippokratischen Schrift *περὶ φύσιος ἀνθρώπου* (E. Höttermann). This Hippokratean work contains a series of excerpts, doubtless made by a physician from a large work *περὶ φ. ἀ.*, which included the seven chapters *περὶ διαίτης ὑγιεινῆς* (Littré).

Miscellen: F. Münzer shows that the daring words: Cur ego te habeam ut principem cum tu me non habebas ut senatorem? which the famous orator Cn. Domitius Afer addressed to the emperor Claudius 48 A. D. (Festschr. f. O. Hirschfeld, Berlin, 1903, 42, 2) were an application of an oft repeated enthymeme, coined by the orator L. Crassus 91 B. C. (Cic. de Or. III 4). Münzer adduces a number of occurrences, even a possible parody in Juvenal II 21 f. An interesting note is added on the repetitions of Fab. Maximus' retort Cic., (Cato 11, Livy XXVII 25, 5).—K. Praechter prints column I of papyrus Berol. N. 8 (=Plat. Phileb. 16 D. E.) with textual comments, and shows how this with column II (Phaedr. 265 C D) furnishes with the anonymous commentary to Theaetetus (Berl. Klass. Texte II) a new illustration of the way in which in the middle Platonic period Aristotle's logic was introduced into Platonic doctrine.—F. Leo emends Reitzenstein's edition of Photius' Lexicon: p. 39, 9 *ἀπελὼν* for *ἀμπελὼν* (MS); p. 48, 18 *Ἄιδῃ τέκνα τίκτουςαι* for *αἰδῇ τ. τ.* also p. 49, 12 and p. 137, 1.—M. Ihm calls attention to two leaves of a Paris glossary (Délisle, Bibl. de l'École des chartes III 5. sér. 1862, p. 510), in which the glosses: *diptica duae tabulae*, *dyptongus dualis sonus*, etc., but especially *dipsa situla serpens* (cf. Isidor orig. XII 4, 13, etc.) may show its value.—B. Warnecke calls attention to Varro's note on Plaut. Pseud. 955 (de l. l. vii 81):

vestibulum, quod est ante domum, etc., overlooked by Lundström (Eranos Vol. I, p. 105/6) and Dörpfeld-Reisch (Gr. Th., p. 208, etc.)—M. Pohlenz combines the unintelligible *ισογραφία* in Diog. Laert. vi 15 (cf. Lid. & Sc.) with Isocrates' love of *παρισώσεις* (Panath. 2 etc. cf. Hermog. II, p. 437 Sp. τὰ παρὰ Ἰσοκράτει ἴσα) and reads Diog. Laert. i. c. Περὶ τῶν δικογράφων. Δεσίᾱς (i. e. *Λυσίας*, non Solutor sed Ligator i. e. reos circumveniens) ἡ Ἰσογράφης. Herewith falls the only support for the friendship of Antisthenes for Lysias (cf. Rh. M. XXXV, p. 142 ff.).—K. Praechter observes that Boethius de cons. phil. 2, 7, to which Büchmann (Gefl. W.²², p. 512) traces the bon mot: O si tacuisses, philosophus mansisses, refers merely to the fact of breaking silence, whereas the usual application to content is found in the homily bearing the name of Greg. Thaum. (Migne Patr. graec. X, p. 1197), but which is more likely by Greg. of Antiocheia (vi century). A theologian was more readily influenced by Proverbs 17, 28, of which source Büchmann thought.—K. Joel, in response to Dittenberger (A. J. P. XXIX 490), says he merely meant that Plutarch says more about the superstition of Nicias than he could have derived from Thucydides and promises a further discussion of Plato's Laches.

Fascicle II.

Ethnika und Verwandtes iv (W. Dittenberger). This paper completes the series (see above, III); a summary of the results has not been found. We have seen the encroachments of derivatives in *-κός* on gentilia, here is shown the reverse tendency. Primitives like Ἑλλην, Θρηᾶξ, Λυδός and derivatives in *-εύς* were used of things in poetry with more or less of personification; also in Herodotus, Xenophon and the artificial prose of the Roman period; but were strictly avoided in pure Attic prose. In dramatic poetry masc. primitives occasionally combine with fem. nouns (cf. Αἰθίοπα φωνήν, Aeschyl.), which was probably due to many gentilia being originally gen. com., like θῆλυς, ἡδύς κ. τ. λ. in Homer and Hesiod. Phoenician and Cilician ships were always ναὺς Φοίνισσα and Κίλισσα and the Malian gulf Μηλιεύς κόλπος down to the ii century A. D.; Thuc. III 96, 3 should read Μηλιᾶ. Derivatives in *-ις* were applied to things oftener than to persons, even in prose, especially countries, lakes, ships, coins, languages and writings; so always Φωκαῖς ἔκτε; very commonly διάλεκτος Ἀθῆν, Δωρίς, Ἰῶν, Αἰολίς, Ἀττικὴ (συγγραφή), further Ἰλιάς, etc.; but usage always required Φωκαϊκὸς στατήρ and μνᾶ, δραχμὴ Ἀττικὴ. Gentilia in *-της* and *-τις* are frequent with Aegyptian νομοί (cf. Ἡρακλεώτης), bodies of water, especially oriental (Παγασίτης, Αἰλανίτης κόλπος) and natural products (Μασσαλιώτης οἶνος, Μαγνήτης λίθος). This usage is commoner in poetry; but forms in *-κός* occur in all these cases (ἡ Μεγαρικὴ as well as ἡ Μεγαρίς). Derivatives in *-ιος* are not strictly gentilia; they differ from those in *-κός* by indicating that a person or thing originated in a place or was essentially and originally

connected with it; whereas the latter designate activities, relationships, etc., that come from the outside. The former are especially common as names of territory, like ἡ Ἀργεΐα, ἡ Κορινθία, and of wines as Θάσιος, Λέσβιος, and in general of foods, dress, weapons, implements, warships, coins, measures, weights, human characteristics and mental products. In all these cases -κός forms are rare except that Ἀττικός, Λακωνικός, Ῥωμαϊκός and in less degree, Ῥοδιακός are regular with things. Where a place or body of water was to be designated with reference to another locality, both -ιος and -κός forms were used like Θερμαῖος and (late) Θερμαϊκός κόλπος. On the other hand in external relationships, derivatives in -ικός (ιακός) are in almost exclusive use with things; thus Αἰγυπτιακός θρίαμβος designates the triumph over the Egyptians, Ἀκτιακὴ νίκη the victory at Actium (Ἐπιδαύριον πόλεμον Thuc. V 26, 2 is exceptional), Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἱστορίας a history of Rome (Αἰγύπτιοι λόγοι, Hdt. II 99, are accounts by the Egyptians). The neuter pl., like Κορινθιακά, was especially common to designate everything that pertained to a place or its inhabitants. Somewhat different are those cases where adjectives in -ιος, -ία, -ιον are derived from primitive gentilia like Ἑλλήμιος, which had to compete with both Ἑλλην and Ἑλληνικός. To avoid the cacophony of -ῥητικός, Κυλικίος and Ἑρήκιος (Θράκιος) were always used. Θρακικός (excepting possibly Θρακικά) belongs to the Byzantine period. There was no objection to Φοινικικός. Βοιωτίος was applied to persons as well as Βοιωτός, and to things according to the above mentioned categories. Pausanias used only Βοιώτια according to the best MSS, nowhere Βοιωτικά. Φρύγια and Λύδια were common. That Θράκιος, Βοιώτιος, Φρύγιος are derived from Θράξ, Βοιωτός, Φρύξ is evident; but Σύριος is an abbreviation of Ἀσσύριος, while Σύρος probably arose through Λευκόςυρος < λευκός Σύριος. Herodotus wrote only Σύριοι; the distinction between this and Σύροι is fanciful (Nöldeke). Ἀράβιος was gradually crowded out by Ἀραψ and Ἀραβικός, though Ἀραβία the country, predominated over ἡ Ἀραβική. In general -ιος forms persisted in geographical treatises and as epithets of gods. Ἰαπύγιος is a rare adjective in prose, it is a noun in ἄκρα Ἰαπυγία, a phrase generally misunderstood. Even more common are derivatives in -νος. In the western region derivatives in -ίνος were in exclusive use. In the eastern countries derivatives in -ανικός, ηνικός, were rare, which is significant for Aristophanes' use of Σαρδιανικός, Φασιανικός, Κυζικηνικός. D. presents many interesting details of usage and criteria for emendations and in general systematizes and throws light on such a work as Pape's Wörterb. d. griech. Eigennamen.

Eine neue Archimedeshandschrift (J. L. Heiberg). H. had his attention called by H. Schöne to a mathematical palimpsest recorded with a few extracts in Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, Vol. IV, publ. 1899. Recognizing this as a work of Archimedes H. journeyed to Constantinople and discovered on some 118 pages of parchment, written at right angles to a superimposed prayerbook, in two columns, in fairly legible x century minuscules (but a

facsimile page reveals the difficulty of decipherment), large parts of *Περὶ σφαίρας καὶ κυλίνδρου*, nearly the whole of *Περὶ ἐλίκων* and something of *Κύκλου μέτρησις* and *Ἰσορροπικά* in a text only slightly better than the one already known. But important is the Greek text of *Περὶ ὀχουμένων*, hitherto known only through an imperfect Latin version, and most interesting a letter to Eratosthenes, Hermes, p. 243-297, in which he unfolds a method which is analogous to that of the modern calculus. Many of Zeuthen's views as to Archimedes' relation to the Integral calculus are substantiated by this hitherto unknown work. The *κοινή* dialect is probably due to a later transcription. H. thinks that by further study many more of the blurred passages will be intelligible. Photographs are available. A German translation with notes by Zeuthen has appeared in *Bibliotheca Mathematica*.

Das Geburtsjahr des M. Brutus (P. Groebe). Cicero Brut. 324 says: Hortensius . . . annis ante decem causas agere coepit quam tu (Brutus) es natus. Accordingly, as H. began his career 95 B. C. (Brut. 229 and 328), Brutus was born 85 B. C. But Velleius Paterculus II 72, 1 wrote: hunc exitum M. Bruti partium septimum et XXX annum agentis fortuna esse voluit, which fixes 78 B. C. as the date of Brut.' birth. Nipperdey (Opusc., p. 300f.), wrongly computed the birthday of Caelius (=88 B. C., cf. Hermes XXXVI, p. 612f.) to have been 85 B. C. and, as Brutus was younger (Tac. dial. 17, Vell. II 36, 2), decided in favor of 79 B. C. for the date of Brutus' birth (taking *agens*=*natus*), and emended Cic. Brut. 324 to *sedecim*, which modern editors have adopted. But Velleius is shown in a table to have erred in some 36 dates; he himself commonly modified them with *ferè* or *circiter*. Mommsen (St. R. I³ 563-576) established against Nipperdey that through Sulla the legal ages for the office of quaestor, praetor and consul were resp. 37, 40, and 43 years; but that in practise the quaestorship was open to candidates in their 31st year, which under the law of the biennium allowed the tribuneship and aedileship to intervene before the office of praetor. Only the younger Cato seems to have held the office of quaestor as early as his 30th year, though Livy, the ultimate source here, may have erred. That M. Brutus was quaestor 53 B. C. is known through Aur. Vict. de vir. ill. 82, 3 and from the legitimate interval of nine years before his praetorship in 44 B. C. By adding the necessarily completed thirty years G. estimates 84 B. C. as the latest possible date for Brutus' birth and thus substantiates Cicero's date, 85 B. C.

Der Schlachttag von Karrhae (P. Groebe). Ovid Fasti VI 465-469 loosely connects with the festival of Vesta, June 9 (CIL I², p. 319), Crassus' defeat near Karrhae and his death, which followed some three days later (Plut. Crass. 23-31). As the escape of the fugitives from Karrhae was made about the time of full moon (Dio XL 25, 3), the moon being in the sign of Scorpion

(Plut. 29), Crassus' death took place between the 12th and 15th of June. Hence the battle, not Crassus' tragic end (Mommsen, Drumann), fell upon the 9th of June (= May 6th 53 B. C. Julian cal.).

Die Arbeitsweise des älteren Plinius und die Indices auctorum (A. Klotz). K. defends the integrity of Pliny's literary methods against M. Rabenhorst (cf. A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 345), who rejects the enumeration of his sources as pure rhetorical embellishments and tries to show that the *naturalis historia* is simply a compilation from the *libri rerum memoria dignarum* of Verrius Flaccus. But there is no contradiction between : *ex exquisitis auctoribus centum* (praef. 12) and the 473 authors named in the indices of book I. The *centum auctores* were actually read, the additional names found in these were mentioned as the ultimate sources in accordance with ancient custom: Varro et Euhemerus means Euhemerus in Varro. Likewise 6, 49, Demodamas . . . *quem maxime sequimur* in his merely points to the ultimate source, etc. Klotz's arguments are not all convincing.

Miscellen: A. Wilhelm shows that property exempted from public *ἐνεχυρασία* was still liable for private debt; hence the restoration in B. C. H. XXVIII, p. 281, n. 9, end: *μηδὲ εἰάν τις [ιδίαι συναλλ]ίξει* is wrong. With this fragment B. C. H. XXVIII 138, n. 34 connects easily, so that we may read: *μη εἶναι τούτων τῶν χρημάτων ἐνεχυρασίαν μηθεὶ μηδὲ τῶν πρὸς τῇ πόλει σ[υν]η[λ]λαχθέντων μηδὲ εἰάν τις [ὑσ]τερον [συνα]λλάξει, εἰάν μὴ τις ἰδίαι συμβάληι πρὸς Ἡ . . . στρατον.* That one fragment reads *Ἡγίστρατος*, the other *Ἡρόστρατος* indicates a false reading in one of them.—H. Schenkl rejects v. Wilamowitz' emendation in Suidas s. v. *Χιωνίδης* of *πρωταγωνιστήν* to *πρῶτον ἀγωνιστήν* and shows in the case of *πρωτολογία* the possibility of *πρῶτος* in composition meaning 'the first in time' in later writers; but if the passage is to be regarded as from an early and correct writer then *πρωγωνιστήν* would be a preferable reading.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, DE LITTÉRATURE ET D'HISTOIRE
ANCIENNES, XXXI (1907).

Pp. 5-6. R. Cagnat, **Ἀρειοί* or **Ἀρεῖαι*? In J. H. S. xxii (1902), 371, Cronin published an inscription in which Marcellus, the husband of a certain Ancharene, is referred to as priest *θεῶν πατρ[ίων] Ἀρεῶς καὶ Ἀρειῶν*. Cronin did not explain the word *Ἀρειῶν* and Cagnat, who republished the inscription in his *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes*, accentuated the word **Ἀρείων*, having in mind, as he says, some to him unknown *θεοὶ *Ἀρειοί*. Cagnat now thinks that the divinities are female and identifies them with Athena and Aphrodite, both of whom bear the surname of **Ἀρεῖα*.

Pp. 7-21. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus. Critical notes on Amph. 930; As. 851, 896, 921; Aul. 603, 779; Bacch. 140-142, 149, 298, 331-332, 344, 377-378, 380-381, 411, 424-425, 431, 455, 462, 511, 573, 785, 787, 920-921, 979-981, 1082, 1127.

Pp. 22-27. Victor Magnien, Two Comic Fragments in Plutarch, Pericles, Ch. III. The fragment from the *Xείπωνες* of Cratinus is not a choral passage as Kock and Blass think, but it originally consisted of two anapaestic tetrameters, which the author undertakes to restore. The citation from Teleclides, Magnien, unlike other editors, refers to two distinct passages of that poet. One of these passages he regards with Kock and others as an anapaestic tetrameter, but in the other he sees not anapaestic but trochaic verse and offers a restoration which consists of a portion of a trochaic tetrameter followed by a complete verse of the same type.

P. 27. Jules Martha, Dative Quo. In addition to the five instances from Cicero of a dative quo furnished by Birt, Archiv XV, I, 81 sq., 10 other examples are here recorded.

Pp. 28-44. Paul Monceaux, The Works of Petilianus, Donatist Bishop of Constantine (Conclusion. See A. J. P. xxix, 366). Monceaux here furnishes the scant information that he has been able to gather about Petilianus' Epistula II. ad Augustinum, his Liber de schismate Maximianistarum, and his Epistula de ordine partis Donati. He dates the treatise De unico baptismo at about 409 A. D. and prints in full all of the fragments (more than eight pages), the source of which is Augustine's counter-treatise De unico baptismo contra Petilianum. Of the upwards of 150 speeches made by Petilianus at the Conference of Carthage and printed in full in the Reports of that Conference, Monceaux contents himself with mentioning the titles of nineteen of the most important.

P. 44. Louis Havet, Pomponius ap. Non. 477. Read Nescio qui ellam urget, quasi as<serem as>inus, uxorem tuam. ellam (= en illam) is defended against Ribbeck and Lindsay.

Pp. 45-50. Salomon Reinach, Juvenal and Statius. The traditional explanation of Juvenal, Sat. xi, 177-180, is incorrect. After expressing his disgust in Sat. vi at commonplace comparisons of Vergil and Homer, Juvenal himself would hardly have been guilty of the same offence in Sat. xi. Furthermore, as Reinach shows, Juvenal was not fond of Vergil, but, contrary to the general opinion of scholars, he was an admirer of Statius. The carmina of xi, 179 are not the poems of Vergil but those of Statius, who is represented as contesting the palm with pompous (altisoni) Vergil. Altisonus, while conceding to Vergil splendor of diction, is meant to imply the absence of qualities of a higher order. If these conclusions are correct, Juvenal will henceforth

be counted among the enthusiastic admirers of the Thebaid and another name will be added to the list of the obtrectatores Vergilii.

Pp. 51-57. Adhémar d'Alès, The Vienna Tertullian. The Vienna corpus has lately been enriched by a most excellent piece of work, namely volume III of Tertullian, edited by E. Kroymann. The conscientious care bestowed upon the collection and presentation of all the available MS evidence is truly remarkable and Kromayer's acquaintance with the critical work of his predecessors leaves nothing to be desired, but the constitution of the text is characterized by excessive boldness and whilst there have been some brilliant solutions the failures have been more frequent. Nevertheless, the value of the critical apparatus is so great that it alone will always insure for this edition a front rank among works that deal with the establishment of these most difficult texts.

Pp. 58-63. Paul Lejay, Notes on Horace. The correction *ab auaritia* . . . laborat advocated by Bentley and others for *ob auaritiam* . . . laborat in Sat. 1, 4, 26, gives rise to a study of the construction *laborare ab*. The author shows that for Horace and his times the construction must be suspected, and he defends the traditional MS reading against the arguments of Bentley. Sat. 2, 4, 18, *doctus eris* . . . *mersare*, leads to a study of the passive forms of *doceo* with the infinitive. With the participle *doctus* the infinitive is common but is at first confined to poetry; with the other forms, the infinitive is rare. *Doctus* sum with the infinitive is also originally poetical but passes over from poetry into the prose of Nepos, always, however, with a special sense; *docendus* sum with the inf. is found even in the prose of Cicero; *doceor* with inf. is not found in Cicero except for reasons of symmetry. The infinitive with any of the passive forms of *doceo* is foreign to the language of Caesar and the orations of Cicero and, excepting *doctus*, also to Plautus and Terence. In the post-classical period the simple forms of *doceri* are freely used with the infinitive.

Pp. 64-66. Jules Martha, On a Passage of the De Inuentione (1, 4, 5). Read *Quod nostrum illum non fugit Catonem neque Laelium neque Africanum neque horum* (uere dicam) *discipulos Gracchos Africani nepotes* for the absurd traditional reading . . . *neque Laelium, neque horum* (uere dicam) *discipulum Africanum neque Gracchos*, etc.

Pp. 66-67. V. Mortet, Note on a Passage of Vitruvius. Dio Cassius 54, 2 has not the value for dating the treatise of Vitruvius that Morgan, Notes on Vitruvius, p. 9, would assign to it.

Pp. 68-92. Book Notices.

Pp. 93-95. Louis Havet, Palémon-Melqart. In the second line of Plautus, Rud. 160 sq., *Sed o Palaemon, sancte Neptuni comes, Qui hercule (-lis B) socius esse diceris*, Havet proposes to read *Qui h<ic H>ercules Opitulus esse diceris*.

Pp. 96-104. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus (continuation of pp. 7-21). Critical notes on Cas. 143, 230, 231, 271, 313, 332, 347, 613 (and Capt. 920); Cist. 88 (in conjunction with Andr. 392, Most. 779, Rud. 823), 95, 101, 111, 156, 531, 616, 744.

Pp. 105-110. C. E. Ruelle, The Achilles Argument (Aristotle, Phys. VI, 9). MSS 1866 (14th cent.) (A), 1935, 1934 (16th cent.) (B), and 1933 (16th cent.) (C) of the Bibliothèque nationale contain unedited commentaries by Theodorus Metochites on various works of Aristotle. Ruelle edits with critical notes that portion of the commentary on the Physics which deals with Zeno's first two arguments against the possibility of motion. He adds a brief discussion of the relationship of the MSS, furnishes a French translation of the text, and supplies illustrative passages from Gregory of St. Vincent's *Opus geometricum* (Antwerp, 1647) and Paul Tannery's *Pour l'histoire de la science hellène*.

Pp. 111-133. Paul Monceaux, The Gaudentius Documents. Gaudentius was Donatist bishop of Thamugadi. He was one of the seven Donatist spokesmen at the conference of Carthage in 411, but spoke only once during the entire session. About 420, the tribune Dulcitius, in obedience to imperial orders, resolved to enforce the laws against the Donatists in Numidia and issued two edicts, couched in menacing language, in which he called upon the schismatics to give up their church buildings and to render obedience to the laws. These edicts, which had aroused in the Donatists the determination to burn themselves alive in their churches rather than yield, were followed by a more conciliatory letter to the bishop. Gaudentius hurled back a defiant reply, whereupon Dulcitius wrote to St. Augustine for advice and help. This involved the bishop of Hippo in a controversy with Gaudentius. As to the final outcome of the whole matter and the subsequent career of Gaudentius information is entirely lacking. The writings of Augustine that bear upon these proceedings against the Donatists have enabled Monceaux either partially or wholly to reconstruct most of the other documents that deal with the situation. The titles of the various papers arranged in historical succession are as follows: 1. Dulcitii Edictum I. de Donatistis. 2. Dulcitii Edictum II. de Donatistis. 3. Dulcitii ad Gaudentium Epistula. 4. Gaudentii Epistula I. ad Dulcitium. 5. Gaudentii Epistula II. ad Dulcitium. 6. Dulcitii ad Augustinum Epistula. 7. Augustini Epistula ad Dulcitium. 8. Augustini contra Gaudentium Liber I. 9. Gaudentii ad Augustinum Epistula. 10. Augustini contra Gaudentium Liber II. Of these documents 7, 8, and 10 are printed in St. Augustine's collected works and are not here reprinted; of 1, 2, and 6 only the general contents were ascertained; of 3 and 9 important fragments were gathered; but 4 and 5 have been restored in their entirety.

P. 133. Louis Havet, Ennius ap. Non. 147 (obuarare), a false anapaest. In the first line read nam consil<iis t>uis (or con-

sil<iis e>ius) obuarant, but in the next line hic ordo is not to be touched.

Pp. 134-138. Ph. E. Legrand, *Pro machaera turturem* (Plaut. Bacch. 68 sq.). Plautus probably mistook an original *τρίγωνα* for *τρυνόνα* and so made a turtle-dove out of a harp. In line 70, the Greek original probably had only the contrast between galea and corolla plectilis, scaphium and insigne being additions of Plautus. Hasta of line 71 is the translation of the Greek *ἄκων, ἀκόντιον*, and scortum pro scuto recalls the days of the Attic *ἑφηβοί* and may well go back to the *Δις Ἐξαπατών*. Hence it would seem that lines 68 and 70-72 are not mere expansions of the Greek original but are based on the original itself.

Pp. 139-140. Paul Lejay, *Praemium*, Velleius Paterculus II, lxxxviii, 2. Read uixit angusti clauī *praemio* (for *paene* or *pene*) contentus. For praemium in the sense of "privilege", compare Horace, Sat. I, 5, 35 and Ep. I, 9, 11.

Pp. 140-141. P. de Labriolle, Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, xlv, 4 (ed. Rauschen, *Florilegium patristicum*, fasc. iv, Bonn 1906). Read agnoscent suam potius <quam> culpam et suorum, <culpam eorum> qui nos non ante praestruxerunt.

Pp. 142-150. Georges Romain, Plautus, *Captivi*. Interpretation of lines 184, 551, 599, 611-612, 928-930.

Pp. 151-189. D. Serruys, *On Certain Eras used in the Works of the Byzantine Chroniclers*. After defining the mundane era of an author as the number expressing the difference between the year of the world to which that author assigns a certain event and the date assigned to the same event by the Dionysian era, and the Christian era of an author as the year of the world to which he assigns the birth of Christ, the writer proceeds to enumerate the eras that fall within the scope of his article, to wit, the mundane eras of 5492 (Alexandrian era), 5508 (Byzantine era), 5509 (era of the Chronicon Paschale), and 5516; and the Christian eras of 5500, 5501, 5506, 5507, 5508, and 5516. The object of the author has been not the investigation of the details of the methods of computation but the study of the origin, development, relationship, and chronological sequence of the various eras. The article concludes with the statement that whilst the origin of the Byzantine era, its parallel use with the Alexandrian era, and its final victory over the latter, are matters of interest primarily to the historian and the chronologist, yet two of the results obtained are of the utmost importance to the philologist in the editing of texts and particularly of the subscriptions, viz. 1. Till the end of the 10th century, the possibility of the use of the Alexandrian era of 5492 must not be questioned, the mark of recognition being the number of the indiction, which must be larger by unity than the

remainder obtained by dividing the number of the year by 15.
 2. Until the end of the 13th century, there is always uncertainty regarding the Christian era of an author, and this era is in every case independent of the mundane era. It is only in the 14th century that a restoration on the basis of the Christian era of 5508 admits of any degree of probability.

Pp. 190-198. E. Rey, To What Extent may the Text of Fortunatus be Improved? Leo's edition in the *Monumenta Germaniae* marks a great advance over earlier editions, but in the matter of textual criticism, the editor is too conservative. It should be the constant endeavor of an editor of Fortunatus to present the author in a legible form, but this he cannot do unless he removes the nonsense, barbarisms, and flagrant absurdities that mar the text of the MSS. To aid in the work of purgation, Rey offers a large number of emendations and hints that he has others in store.

Pp. 199-201. Antoine Thomas, The Latin Sclarea. This word, which occurs in a culinary receipt appended to Gargilius Martialis, ed. V. Rose (Teubner, 1875), and in a capitulary, an inventory, and a gloss, all three of the 9th century, is not recorded in the majority of the lexica, and is wrongly defined as "pipe" (musical instrument) in all the others except in the posthumous Latin-English dictionary (Cambridge, 1888) of Thomas H. Key († 1875), who correctly defines it as "clary", which corresponds to the French *sclarée*, German *Scharlei*, etc., and is the *Salvia Sclarea* of Linnaeus.

Pp. 202-205. G. Rodier, On a Passage of the *De Finibus*. In 4, 18, 50, Jam ille sorites <est>, quo nihil putatis esse vitiosus, quod bonum sit, id esse optabile; quod optabile, id expetendum; quod expetendum, id laudabile; dein reliqui gradus . . . , the MS vitiosus is to be retained and Madvig's interpretation is undoubtedly to be regarded as the best that has been offered. But Madvig thinks that there is no warrant here for the use of the term sorites, and Hirzel goes so far as to say that Cicero was laboring under a misapprehension as to the real meaning of the word. The truth of the matter is that Cicero well knew the meaning of the word sorites and the solution of the difficulty must be sought in the fact that though the argument in question is not a sorites but a *συνθετικὸν θεώρημα*, yet the latter resembles the former somewhat, and, roughly speaking, is based upon the same method of procedure, to wit, the introduction of a sufficient number of intermediary terms between the two extremes so as to produce the impression of a continuous transition. The Stoics, whose favorite argument was the *συνθετικὸν θεώρημα*, were in the habit of denouncing the sorites, the traditional weapon of their adversaries, and in this passage the opponent of the Stoics is represented as retorting, rightly or wrongly, that now they were

themselves using a sorites. "When you put it that way", says he, "... you are forthwith guilty of a sorites yourselves, a form of argument you consider faulty above all others."

Pp. 206-228. Book Notices.

P. 229. H. Weil, Aeschyl. Eum. 238. Read *προστετριμμένον πάρος* for *προστετριμμένον τε πρόσ*.

Pp. 230-233. Louis Havet, The Perfect in -ēre in Plautus. The perfect in -ēre is used by Plautus only in elision and when a short syllable is needed before a consonant, otherwise the form in -ērunt is the rule. This principle is useful in textual criticism and is employed by the author in the correction of Men. 1151 and Capt. 824. Terence and other early scenic poets are less rigid than Plautus in discarding needless -ēre forms.

Pp. 233-234. Louis Havet, Notes in Prosody. The Plautine ū of *pecūlatus* is confirmed by the Ciceronian *clausulae certissimumque peculatum* (Verr. 3, 168) and *carere peculatus* (Phil. 12, 12). In Plautus, Rud. 107, for *uirile sexus* read *uirile sēcus*. The passage shows that *e* in *secus* is long. Perhaps, as S. Reinach suggests, *sēcus* is related to *saeculum*.

P. 234. Louis Havet, *novīcius*, *multīcius*. To account for the *ī* in *novīcius* as compared with nominal derivatives *patricius*, etc., Havet supposes that the primitive form was **noui-uicius*, or more accurately **newo-woikios*. If the word *multicia* (n. pl.), thrice used by Juvenal with *ī*, is derived from *multus*, Juvenal must have been misled as to the quantity by the false analogy of verbal derivatives in -*tīcius* or perhaps by the quantity of a compound like *trilix*, *trilicis*.

Pp. 235-240. C. E. Ruelle, The Musical Papyrus of Hibeh. With the view of confirming the opinion of Blass and the English editors that Hibeh Papyri, I, 13, is the beginning of an oration delivered by Hippias of Elis at the Olympian games, Ruelle, in addition to making a few independent observations, presents an array of passages referring to Hippias from the ancient authors, and reëdits the text of the papyrus with critical notes and a French translation.

Pp. 241-250. Paul Monceaux, A Work of the Donatist Fulgentius. Reconstruction of the text of the *Libellus de baptismo*, supposedly the work of a Donatist by the name of Fulgentius. With but slight modifications this text consists of the words spoken by the anonymous Donatist and by Fulgentius in a dialogue that is found among the works attributed to St. Augustine and that figures in Migne's *Patrol. lat.* under the title of *Contra Fulgentium donatistam incerti auctoris liber*. The work just mentioned was probably written between 411 and 420 A. D. and the author was most likely one of the entourage of St. Augustine. Nothing is known of the identity of Fulgentius. That he was not a bishop

would appear from the fact that his name is not found in the list of bishops that attended the great conference at Carthage.

Pp. 251-264. D. Serruys, *The Transformations of the Aera Alexandrina Minor*. The name Alexandrian is applied to several systems of chronology that show a common mean difference of 5492 between their dates and the corresponding dates of the Dionysian or Christian era. The first of these systems, and the parent of the others, is the *Era of Panodorus*, which was originated about 412 A. D. by the Alexandrian monk Panodorus. In opposition to the theory of Unger, who assigned the beginning of this era to Aug. 29, 5494 B. C., Serruys presents an elaborate defence of the view that prevailed before Unger's time, which regarded Aug. 29, 5493 B. C. as the starting point. In regard to the Christian era of Panodorus, Serruys establishes the fact that Panodorus dated Jesus' conception at March 25, 5493 of the Panodorian era and Jesus' birth at Dec. 25, 5494 (= March 25 and Dec. 25, 1 A. D.). According to the current view, Panodorus dated these occurrences one year earlier. *Annianus* modified Panodorus' system so as to make it more conformable to religious tradition. As March 25 was the traditional date of Jesus' conception and resurrection, he started his mundane era March 25, 5492 B. C., 209 days later than the beginning of the Panodorian era. To find his Christian era, Annianus started with the year 5533, in which the Passover fell on Friday, March 23. By counting back 32 years, he gained Wednesday, Dec. 25, 5501 as the date of Jesus' birth. Wednesday is the fourth day of the week, the day on which the sun was created, and is therefore symbolical of the Sun of Righteousness. As Annianus had selected the day of Jesus' conception (March 25) for the beginning of his mundane era, he used the same day, and not the day of the nativity, as the starting-point of his Christian era. The era of Annianus with slight modifications became the official era of the Byzantine Church, and was then known as the *Ecclesiastical Era*. These modifications consisted in the transfer of the beginning of both the mundane and Christian eras from March 25 to March 23. The era used by the majority of the Byzantine chroniclers of the 9th and 10th centuries and specifically by Theophanes, was a compromise between the ecclesiastical era and the civil year. From Panodorus it borrowed the mundane era of Aug. 29, 5493 B. C., and from Annianus the Christian era, which makes the year 1 A. D. equal the year of the world 5501. The chroniclers that employ this system of chronology refer to it as the *ψήφος κατὰ τοὺς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς*. By the *Ἀλεξανδρεῖς* Serruys thinks the Copts were meant and he closes his article with the admonition that we must beware of imitating the Byzantines in applying the archaic and vague name of Alexandrian to several perfectly distinct though related systems of chronology.

Pp. 265-296. Louis Havet, *Notes on Plautus* (continuation

of pages 96-104). Critical notes on Curc. 10-11; 15-17; 21-22; 26; 27-28; 37-38; 39-41; 43; 46; 59-62; 76, 78-79, 80 (in connection with Merc. 512, Ps. 609, 634, Rud. 99, Trin. 891, Truc. 641, Andr. 502); 88 and 71; 96; 110-111, 159; 116, 118; 123-124, 139; 125-127; 129; 131-132 (in conj. with Pers. 622, Ep. 554, Truc. 366, Ht. 397 and 403, Eun. 1009, Ad. 269); 138 sqq.; 142; 175-177; 189; 219; 271; 351-352; 381-382; 438; 486; 537; 547, 548 (in conj. with Rud. 1226, Men. 581, Mil. 791); 554; 567; 614; 618.

P. 297. Jean Lesquier, *λαάρχης*. In an IS published by Botti in Bull. de la Soc. arch. d'Alexandrie, iv, p. 94, occurs the word *ἀλάρχαι*. Strack, Arch. für Pap. II, 548, No. 27, changed *ἀλάρχαι* to *ἰλάρχαι*. But *ἀλάρχαι* is very likely an incorrect reading of an original *ΛΑΔΡΧΑΙ* for *λαάρχαι*. The Tebtunis Papyri contain the word *λααρχία*, which means "a contingent of native troops". Hence it is altogether probable that *λαάρχης* is the name that was applied to the commander of a *λααρχία*.

Pp. 298-308. Jules Nicole, Critical Notes on the New Fragments of Menander. The fragments referred to are the ones contained in the Aphroditopolis papyrus published by Lefebvre. Even when at its best the MS does not present a careful text. Mistakes of every kind abound and the mistakes arising from transposition are not the least numerous. Nicole presents more than fivescore corrections.

Pp. 309-328. Book Notices.

Review of Reviews and of Publications of Academies relating to Classical Antiquity.

C. W. E. MILLER.